

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 14, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice to expedite allowance of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 have been amended.

Claim 50 has been added.

Claims 1, 5, 6-8, 13, and 50 are pending.

Objection to the Specification:

The Final Office Action raised an objection to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and specified that correction was required. In the amendment to paragraph [0030] above, the specification has been corrected to overcome this objection without adding any new matter.

More specifically, the clarifying amendment to paragraph [0030] simply further points out that which is clearly shown in the originally filed drawings, and in particular Figure 3. The clarifying text states “As illustrated in Figure 3, the finger stops 324 present a combined surface area that is substantially equal to the difference between the surface area of the printer interface portion 350 and the area of the user interface end of the container”. The surface areas relating to the finger stops, the grasping portion and the printer interface portion were clearly stated in the originally filed specification and the drawings clearly support the stated size relationship between these areas. Moreover, one skilled in the art would clearly recognize such size relationships given the original text and drawings. Thus, no new matter has been added.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the objection is overcome.

Claim Rejections:

Claims 1, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yamamoto et al. (US 20030234844 A1).

With consideration given to the amendments to Claims 1, 5 and 6 above, the Final Office Action essentially alleges that in Fig. 2 of Yamamoto et al. the user interface end (14a) has an area that is less than the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) and the finger stops (25) have a combined surface area that is substantially equal to the difference between the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) and the area of the user interface end (14a).

Applicants submit that these assertions are incorrect and traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

As can be seen in the top view of Fig. 2(a) and the bottom view of Fig. 2(d) of Yamamoto et al. the user interface end (14a) does not have an area that is less than the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23). Indeed, if anything it would appear that the user interface end (14a) has an area that is about the same if not larger than the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23). This is illustrated in Figs. 2(a) and (d) wherein the user interface end (14a) is obviously wider than the printer interface end (14b) and the apparently slotted blades 22 and 23 of Fig. 2(d) appear to not add much to the surface area of the printer interface end. Furthermore, Figs. 2 (b) and (c) illustrate that there is a taper to the body such that the user interface end (14a) will be larger in both width and length (i.e., area) than printer interface end (14b).

Consequently, the assertion that the user interface end (14a) has an area that is less than the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) is either indeterminable and/or simply incorrect.

With this in mind, the assertion that the finger stops (25) have a combined surface area that is substantially equal to the difference between the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) and the area of the user interface end (14a) is also either indeterminable and/or simply incorrect for at least the following obvious reasons.

Firstly, if as pointed out earlier the area of the user interface end (14a) is the same or greater than the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23), then the Office Action assertion in the above paragraph is illogical and impossible from a mathematical perspective as this would require that the combined surface area of the finger stops (25) to be either zero or a negative value. Clearly, in the real world a surface area cannot be zero or a negative value.

Secondly, even assuming for the sake of argument that the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) is slightly greater than the area of the user interface end (14a), it seems clear from the drawings in Fig. 2 of Yamamoto et al. that the combined surface area of the finger stops (25) would appear to be significantly greater than any reasonable difference between the surface area of the printer interface end (14b with blades 22 and 23) and the area of the user interface end (14a). Indeed, it seems that the surface area (width x length) of even just one of the finger stops (25) could be considered about the same as the area of the user interface end (14a).

Thirdly, Claim 1 recites that the finger stops extend outwardly from a grasping portion. However, the Final Office Action fails to identify any specific grasping portion in Yamamoto et al.

Dependent **Claims 7 and 8** stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 20030234844 A1) in view of Carrese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,390,615).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn given the clarifying amendments to independent claim 1, from which Claims 7 and 8 depend, and for at least the clearly patently differentiating reasons stated above with regard to Claims 1-6.

Both Yamamoto et al. and Carrese et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise suggest finger stops that are positioned between a printer interface end and a user interface end, extend outwardly from the grasping portion and have a combined surface area approximately equal to the difference between the surface area of the printer interface portion and the area of the user interface.

Dependent **Claim 13** stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 20030234844 A1) in view of Carrese et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,390,615) and in further view of Hinami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,652).

Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn given the clarifying amendments to independent claim 1, from which Claim depends, and for at least the clearly patently differentiating reasons stated above with regard to Claims 1-6.


Yamamoto et al., Carrese et al. and Hinami et al., alone or in combination, fail to disclose or otherwise suggest finger stops that are positioned between a printer interface end and a user interface end, extend outwardly from the grasping portion and have a combined surface area approximately equal to the difference between the surface area of the printer interface portion and the area of the user interface.

200206249-1

For at least the reasons stated herein, independent **Claim 1** and dependent **Claims 5, 6-8, 13, and 50** which add further limitations thereto, are clearly patentable over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 4/27/06



Thomas A. Jolly
Registration No. 39,241